



Patent and Trademark Office

Address: C1 COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/700,165	02/11/85	CLUM	C JEP-246

LEONARD P. PRUGAK
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER	
LIPOVSKY, J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
125	//

DATE MAILED: 09/15/86

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- ☐ is extended to run _____ from the date of the Final Rejection
- ☒ continues to run THREE (3) MONTHS from the date of the Final Rejection
- ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date that the shortened statutory period for response expires as set forth above

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed SEPTEMBER 2, 1986 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
 - ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
 - ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
 - ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☐ Upon the filing of an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be ☐ will not be, entered and the status of the claims in this application would be as follows:
- Allowed claims: _____
- Claims objected to: _____
- Claims rejected: _____
- However:
- ☐ The rejection of claims _____ on references is deemed to be overcome by applicant's response.
 - ☐ The rejection of claims _____ on non-reference grounds only is deemed to be overcome by applicant's response.
4. ☒ The affidavit ~~AND~~ ^{HAVE} request for reconsideration ~~has~~ been considered but ~~does~~ not overcome the rejection.
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☒ Other THE DATA IN THE SPECIFICATION AND THE NEWLY SUBMITTED AFFIDAVITS TAKEN AS A WHOLE DO NOT SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS OF SYNERGISM REGARDING A MICONAZOLE NITRATE : ZINC OXIDE RATIO OF 1:60. UPON APPEAL THE CLAIMS STAND REJECTED FOR REASONS ALREADY OF RECORD.

J. Lipovsky
PTOL-305 (REV. 11-85)Leonard Schenkman
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 125